



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,397	07/19/2001	Robert B. Franks	5897-000008	9903

27572 7590 10/05/2006

HARNESSE, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

AKINTOLA, OLABODE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3691

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/909,397		FRANKS ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Olabode Akintola		3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/6/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grainger (USPAP 20020161733) (Grainger1) in view of Grainger (USPAP 20020091542) (Grainger2).

Re claims 1, 14, 29-30, 36 and 38-41: Grainger1 teaches a method of determining a cost data relating to a cost of a registered trade mark application (section 0024), said method characterized by comprising the steps of: receiving input data describing a trade mark (Fig. 1, RN{10}); receiving input data describing at least one territory (Fig. 1, RN{6}); storing component cost data relating to a plurality of component costs of said registered trade mark application in at least one territory (sections 0008 and 0035).

Grainger1 does not explicitly teach receiving input data describing a number of classes of goods/services for a said registered trade mark application. However, Grainger1 teaches applicability of the invention to include trademark and copyrights (section 0024). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Grainger1 to include this step as normally applicable in the registration of trade mark applications.

Grainger1 does not explicitly teach calculating substantially in real time said cost data relating to a cost of said registered trade mark application from said stored data.

Grainger2 teaches calculating substantially in real time said cost data relating to a cost of said registered trade mark application from said stored data (Fig. 5; section 0011). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Grainger1 to include this step as taught by Grainger2. One would have been motivated to do this in order to provide a total cost of registering the trade mark application.

Thus the combination of Grainger1 and Grainger2 is hereinafter referred to as “Modified Grainger”.

Re claim 2: Modified Grainger teaches the step wherein a said calculated cost data is generated by: reading said stored cost data from a look up table comprising a plurality of individual component costs for each of a plurality of individual territories; and adding a plurality of said individual component costs to obtain said calculated cost data (Grainger1: section 0035; Grainger2: Fig 5).

Re claim 3: Modified Grainger teaches the step of: displaying said calculated cost substantially in real time (Grainger2: Fig. 5).

Re claim 4: Modified Grainger teaches the step of: calculating said calculated data cost in a plurality of different currencies (Grainger2: Fig. 5).

Re claim 5: Modified Grainger teaches the step of calculating comprises calculating a said calculated cost in a first currency, and converting said calculated cost to a second currency (Grainger2: Fig. 5).

Re claim 6: Modified Grainger teaches the step of: making said calculated cost data available for substantially real time display (Grainger2: Fig. 5).

Re claim 7: Modified Grainger teaches the step of storing data comprises, for each of a plurality of territories: storing at least one official fee cost data relating to an official fee payable to a governmental/intergovernmental body; and storing at least one vendor fee cost data relating to a vendor fee charged by a vendor of trade mark services (Grainger1: section 0035; Grainger2: Fig 5).

Re claim 8: Modified Grainger teaches the step of calculating a cost substantially in real time comprises the steps of: reading from a look up table, a vendor filing cost; reading from said look up table an official fee for filing said trade mark; and adding said vendor filing fee cost and said

Art Unit: 3624

official filing fee cost (Grainger1: section 0035; Grainger2: Fig 5).

Re claim 9: Modified Grainger teaches the step of receiving data describing a trade mark comprises inputting a bitmap representing a two dimensional image of said trade mark (Grainger1: Fig. 3J RN{82}, section 0070; Grainger2: Fig 5).

Re claim 10: Modified Grainger teaches the step of storing data relating to cost of said registered trade mark application in said country comprises: for each of a plurality of territories, storing data describing; a plurality of official fee component costs, describing individual official fees for various operations; a plurality of vendor fee component costs, each describing a vendor fee levied for a specific service; a plurality of associate fee component costs, each describing a cost for a service for a specified item levied by an associate (Grainger1: section 0035).

Re claims 11-13: Modified Grainger does not explicitly teach the step comprising: reading from said look up table a vendor priority cost data for claiming a priority, a vendor seniority cost for claiming a seniority and a vendor designation cost for designation of a territory; and adding said vendor priority cost data, said vendor seniority cost and vendor designation cost to said vendor filing cost and said official filing fee cost. However, Grainger1 teaches applicability of the invention to include trademark and copyrights (section 0024). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Grainger1 to include these steps as normally applicable in the registration of trade mark applications.

Re claim 15: Modified Grainger teaches the step wherein said step of displaying comprises making said real time calculated cost available for display via a web server apparatus (Grainger2: Figs. 1 and 5).

Re claim 16: Modified Grainger teaches wherein said displayed cost is recalculated substantially in real time to reflect a modified cost of said trade mark for a modification (Grainger2: Fig. 5). Modified Grainger does not explicitly teach modifying a specification of goods/services by selecting/deselecting classes of goods/services. However, Grainger1 teaches creating, modifying and deleting selected case meta data associated with a case (section 0063). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Grainger1 to include this step as normally applicable in the registration of trade mark applications i.e. selecting/deselecting classes of goods/services.

Re claims 17-18: See claims 1 and 16 analyses above.

Re claim 19: Modified Grainger teaches wherein: said step of inputting at least one territory for said trade mark comprises selecting a plurality of territories from a menu display listing said plurality of territories, said method further comprising the steps of: modifying a selection of said territories by selecting/deselecting individual territory icons on a screen display, to obtain a modified selection of territories; wherein said displayed cost is recalculated substantially in real time to reflect a modified cost of said trade mark for said modified selection of territories

(Grainger2: Fig. 5).

Re claims 20-23 and 31-32, 37: Modified Grainger teaches modifying said selection of data by selecting/deselecting to obtain a modified data selection; wherein said displayed cost is recalculated substantially in real time to represent a modified cost of said trade mark for said modified selection (Grainger2: Fig. 5). Modified Grainger does not explicitly teach priority claim and seniority claims. However, Grainger1 teaches applicability of the invention to include trademark and copyrights (section 0024). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Grainger1 to include these steps as normally applicable in the registration of trade mark applications.

Re claim 24: Modified Grainger teaches the step of: inputting at least one designated territory for a regional trade mark; wherein said displayed cost is recalculated in real time according to said input of said at least one designated territory (Grainger2: Fig. 5).

Re claim 25: Modified Grainger teaches displaying a set of component costs used for calculating said substantially real time calculated costs; and selecting/deselecting individual said component costs to modify said real time calculated cost of said trade mark (Grainger2: Fig. 5; Grainger1: sections 0035 and 0063).

Re claim 26: Modified Grainger teaches the step of: selecting a currency of a plurality of different currencies, in which said cost is displayed (Grainger2: Fig. 5).

Re claim 27: Modified Grainger teaches wherein said component costs comprise costs selected from the set: official fees payable to governmental/intergovernmental bodies; and vendor fees levied by a vendor providing a trade mark service (Grainger1: section 0035)

Re claim 28: Modified Grainger teaches displaying a said component cost in a currency selected from a plurality of different currencies (Grainger2: Fig. 5; Grainger1: sections 0035 and 0063).

Re claim 33: Modified Grainger teaches displaying a number of designated territories relating to said trade mark (Grainger2: Fig. 5).

Re claim 34. See claim 30 analysis above.

Re claim 35. See claims 30 and 31 analyses above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Grainger (USPAP 20020111824) discloses a method of defining workflow rules for managing intellectual property.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olabode Akintola whose telephone number is 571-272-3629. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM -5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 571-272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OA



VINCENT MILLIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600